



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,656	12/22/2000	Eugene J. Rollins	50269-0511	9824
29315	7590	05/16/2005	EXAMINER	
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC 12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 900 RESTON, VA 20190				POND, ROBERT M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3625		

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

**MAY 16 2005**

**GROUP 3600**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/747,656

Filing Date: December 22, 2000

Appellant(s): ROLLINS ET AL.

Mr. Rick A. Toering, Reg. # 43,195  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 08 February 2005.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Grouping of Claims***

The rejection of claims 1-6 and 9-14 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

**(8) *ClaimsAppealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) *Prior Art of Record***

6,0164,504 ARNOLD 1-2000

**(10) *Grounds of Rejection***

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-6 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on 11 May 2004.

**(11) *Response to Argument***

Arnold does not appear to disclose at least generating by the intermediary, an updated second electronic document that includes a second object associated with the first address:

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant. Arnold discloses consumers accessing a virtual outlet for the purpose of conducting electronic commerce over the Internet. The virtual outlet commerce site provides each online consumer with electronic access to a plurality of online merchants through a virtual outlet Web site managed by a computer (please see at least Fig. 1A (1A10, 1A11, 1A01-1A04, 1A09); col. 5, lines 24-40; col. 6, line 65 through col. 7, line 29). Arnold discloses the virtual outlet providing a first electronic document requested by the consumer that provides merchant shopping data and electronic URL addresses referred to as hot links to second electronic documents (please note: the term hot link is a common synonym for hyperlink that is not challenged by the Appellant) (please see Fig. 1B (1B10-“ACME Cyberstore”); Fig. 25; col. 5, lines 41-42). Second electronic documents are dynamically created using online

merchant data and images (Fig. 1B (1B20, 1B30); col. 7, line 30 through col. 8, line 6). Arnold discloses the second electronic document being generated and displayed to the consumer (see Fig. 1B (1B30-“ACME Cyberstore”)), and further discloses the virtual outlet passing to the second electronic document a URL address (col. 6, lines 6-12) used in the generation and updating of the second electronic document (please note: both the virtual outlet and the selected online merchant contribute to the generation of the second document). The virtual outlet provides to the second electronic document a URL address associated with the first electronic document that is specifically associated with an icon on the second electronic document (please see Fig. 1B (1B20-“ACME Cyberstore”, 1B30-“ACME Cyberstore”, “RETURN” icon; col. 8, lines 4-6) (please note: the RETRUN icon links the consumer to the virtual outlet that directed the consumer to the merchant site which provides more functionality than the standard “BACK” button on a web browser). Arnold discloses at least generating by the intermediary, an updated second electronic document that includes a second object associated with the first address.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Pond  
Primary Examiner  
May 11, 2005

Conferees

Ms. Wynn Coggins, SPE, AU3625 

Mr. John Weiss, SPE, Appeal Conference Specialist 

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC  
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD  
SUITE 900  
RESTON, VA 20190